City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

Department of Planning & Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director

CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS, RECOMMENDATION AND DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Application Number: 2307767

Applicant Name: Matthew Horwitz for South Seattle Community College

Address of Proposal: 6000 16th Avenue SW, Seattle WA. 98106

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

City Council Action: Approval of a new Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP) for South Seattle Community College (SSCC).

SEPA DETERMINATIONS

[ ] Exempt [ ] DNS [ ] MDNS [ ] EIS

[**X**] EIS involving another Lead Agency with jurisdiction (South Seattle Community College)

[ ] DNS with conditions

[ ] DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition involving another Lead Agency with jurisdiction

INTRODUCTION

This report is the Director's analysis and recommendation to the City Council on the South Seattle Community College (SSCC) Final Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP). The report considers the recommendations of the SSCC Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), the environmental analysis and comments in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), and the applicable portions of the adopted policies and regulations of the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Title 23, the Land Use Policies and Code. The State of Washington, Seattle Community College District/South Seattle Community College is the Lead Agency for the purposes of SEPA.

The Director recommends approval of the Final MIMP subject to the conditions noted in this report.

This report is divided into seven sections.

- **Section I** includes background information on the project, including application history, a description of the project site, the CAC and public comment.
- **Section II** identifies the general purpose, vision and goals of SSCC's final MIMP.
- **Section III** discusses the final MIMP's elements.
- **Section IV** analyzes the final MIMP's compliance with major institution policies and codes, including a comprehensive analysis of impacts and recommended mitigation pursuant to SMC Section 23.69.032.E.

- **Section V** analyzes the final MIMP's compliance with applicable rezone criteria.
- **Section VI** summarizes how the SEPA Overview Policies apply and limit substantive SEPA analysis and mitigation.
- **Section VII** summarizes the various analyses and lists the conditions recommended by the Director.

I. BACKGROUND DATA

The planned and potential projects include classroom, academic and student support, vocational training, physical plant/operations, and student housing space. Existing buildings at the campus total approximately 501,363 square feet. Total new planned and potential construction includes up to 595,500 square feet amounting to a net increase of approximately 502,400 square feet with demolitions. The total square footage of campus buildings following construction of both planned and potential projects will be 805,363 to 1,003,363 square feet. Parking will continue to be provided in existing established parking lots and new parking facilities on campus that are accessory to both planned and potential buildings. The existing 1,220 parking spaces located in surface lots will be increased by 456 planned and potential parking spaces for a total of 1676 spaces.

There are four planned projects in Phase I[1] of the MIMP[2]:

1) Removal of four existing portable structures and construction of the University Center, a two-story, 15,000 square foot classroom building (Building A);
2) Renovation and a 1,300 square foot expansion of the existing Pastry Annex (Building B);
3) Renovation and a 2,200 square foot expansion of the existing Automotive Collision Repair Building (Building C); and
4) Demolition of the existing Landscape Horticulture storage building and replacement with a one-story 5,000 square foot building (Building D).

Construction of all planned Phase I projects requires demolition of five buildings (including four portables) totaling approximately 16,000 square feet.

There are nine near-term potential projects in Phase I of the MIMP:

1) Replacement of the existing Child Care Building with a one-story, 8,100 to 14,100 square foot structure (Building E);
2) Construction of a one-story Plant Operations Building containing 9,000 to 16,000 square feet (Building F);
3) Construction of a one and one-half-story Physical Education Building containing 21,500 square feet (Building G);
4) Replacement of the Cascade Court Building with a two to three-story Student Center containing 11,200 to 16,800 square feet (Building H);
5) Construction of a one-story Academic and Student Support structure of approximately 4,000 square feet (Building I);

---

[1] "Planned development" is "development which the Major Institution has definite plans to construct." SMC 23.69.030D. The SSCC MIMP includes a near-term (ten to fifteen years) Phase I and a long-term (fifteen to thirty years) Phase II.

[2] The first two listed Phase I projects do not require MIMP approval to proceed. The first project (University Center) is now underway. The second project (Pastry Annex) has been completed.

6) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support structure consisting of classrooms, labs, and administrative space totaling approximately 25,200 to 65,100 square feet (Building J);
7) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support building containing approximately 43,400 to 65,100 square feet (Building K);
8) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support building containing approximately 14,700 to 22,000 square feet (Building L); and
9) Construction of a Student Housing complex consisting of two to three-story buildings totaling 64,100 to 88,200 square feet providing 80 units (270 beds) of student housing (Building Complex M).

Construction of all potential Phase I projects would require demolition of four buildings totaling approximately 57,000 square feet.

In addition to the potential projects above, there are several long-term potential projects in Phase II of the MIMP:

1) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support structure consisting of classrooms, labs, and administrative space totaling approximately 25,200 to 37,800 square feet (Building N);
2) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support structure totaling approximately 16,800 to 25,200 square feet (Building O);
3) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support structure totaling approximately 44,400 to 66,600 square feet (Building P);
4) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support structure totaling approximately 19,500 to 29,400 square feet (Building Q);
5) Construction of a two to three-story Academic and Student Support structure totaling approximately 33,000 to 50,000 square feet (Building R);
6) Construction of a Physical Plant Building totaling approximately 15,400 to 23,100 square feet (Building S); and
7) Construction of Student Housing consisting two buildings of 10,000 to 15,000 and 8,000 to 12,000 square feet providing 26 units (90 beds) of student housing (Buildings T and U respectively).

Major Institution Overlay/Rezone

While no changes are proposed to the current area of the MIO bounded by 16th Avenue SW to the west, SW Brandon Street to the north, SW Morgan Street to the south, and the Duwamish Greenbelt to the east, the campus area that is currently zoned MIO-37 would be rezoned to MIO-50 to accommodate the planned and potential developments detailed above. In particular, this rezone to MIO-50 would accommodate three-story buildings with floor-to-floor heights greater than those possible under the existing zoning. The campus area that is currently zoned MIO-105 would not be enlarged or changed as part of this rezone.

The following approvals are required as part of the Master Plan:

- City Council Approval – Adoption of a new Major Institution Master Plan (Chapter 23.69, Seattle Municipal Code)
- Rezone (Chapter 23.34, Seattle Municipal Code)
- Substantive SEPA Review
  (Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code & WAC Chapter 197-11)

A. Procedural Milestones

SSCC initiated the process by notifying the Department of Planning and Development of its intent to prepare a new major institution master plan on December 17, 2003. The formation of the Citizen Advisory Committee began with confirmation of membership by the City Council on May 17, 2004 under Resolution 30677. The SSCC notice of application occurred on February 12, 2004. Public scoping of the environmental impact analysis occurred in June 2004 with a public scoping meeting held on June 23, 2004. The Draft MIMP and Draft EIS were issued on April 7, 2005 followed by a 45-day public comment period that included a public hearing on April 27, 2005. The Final MIMP and Final EIS were issued on January 27, 2006. Regular CAC meetings occurred throughout the process totaling some 14 meetings. DPD issued this Director's report in draft, and the CAC also issued its report in draft. Next procedural steps include issuance of final CAC and Director's reports, review and findings of the Hearing Examiner, and then consideration and action by the City Council.

B. Prior Approvals

The Seattle City Council adopted the current SSCC master plan in June 1993 (Ordinance Number 116758). The plan addressed a ten-year period (1993-2003) and most of the envisioned projects have been completed. While the SSCC master plan still reflects the College's vision, changed conditions and new opportunities require that the plan be revisited.

C. Site Description

The SSCC campus[3] encompasses a single area of approximately 87 acres, which includes a 6-acre arboretum. The campus is oriented in a north-south direction, extending approximately 3300 feet. Along the east-west axis, the campus ranges from 1100 to 1700 feet in width. The campus has an approximate elevation of 320 feet. The campus is bounded by 16th Avenue SW to the west, SW Brandon Street to the north, SW Morgan Street to the south. To the immediate east lies the Duwamish Greenbelt, a City-designated environmentally critical area (steep slope). The campus is mostly located on a plateau, sloping steeply towards the east and the greenbelt and gradually towards the west and 16th Avenue SW; most campus buildings are located on the generally flat plateau at an elevation of 15 to 20 feet above the grade of 16th Avenue SW.

Current campus development includes 35 buildings comprising approximately 500,000 square feet of gross floor area. These buildings serve a variety of purposes related to the college's mission including classroom, administrative, laboratory, technical workshop, student services, and physical plant space. Most of the buildings are one-story structures, many with high bay shops for technical programs. The Library and the principal classroom buildings are two to three-stories. Parking is primarily in two large lots, one each at the north and south ends of the campus.

D. Vicinity Description

The neighborhood vicinity is predominately single-family residential and moderate to high-density development (in terms of Seattle's single-family development standards, not compared to multifamily housing), although areas to the immediate south and east of campus are largely

[3] Although SSCC offers programs at three campuses (the Main Campus in West Seattle, the Duwamish Education Center, and the NewHolly Learning Center), the MIMP and FEIS only address development activity at the Main Campus.

undeveloped. To the west across 16th Avenue SW, the area is predominantly one and two-story homes, with the tree-lined median on 16th providing a natural screen. The Duwamish Greenbelt lies to the east and extends 1000 feet from campus down to West Marginal Way. The Greenbelt is densely forested and much of it is a steep slope and has been designated an Environmentally Critical Area (ECA) because of its landslide potential. The topographic relief and dense foliage also serve to screen the campus from the manufacturing/industrial area located on West Marginal Way.

Immediately northeast of the SSCC arboretum, which serves several instructional purposes, 4.6 acres have been leased to the Seattle Chinese Garden Society. The City has approved permits to construct the first phase of a Chinese Garden and associated buildings.

Directly south of campus is twenty acres of undeveloped City-owned land that Mayor Nickels has indicated will be preserved as greenbelt space.

E. Public Comment and Agency Comment

Public input was obtained during the scoping of the environmental analysis in June 2004, including a public scoping meeting. Written comments were received during the public review of the Draft EIS from April 7 through May 9, 2005 (45 days) and comments were transcribed from the public hearing on April 27, 2005. Six public agencies and one private individual provided written comments regarding the Draft EIS. All meetings of the Citizen Advisory Committee were open to the public, publicized at several times during the process, and public input was provided to the CAC.

F. Citizen Advisory Committee

Consultation between DPD and the CAC took place throughout the review period and the two recommendations are largely consistent.

G. Changes to Master Plan in response to Comments

The Final MIMP and FEIS propose a revision in zoning for most of the campus from MIO-37 to MIO-50 without increasing the proposed square footage for development. The change reflects the need to accommodate current classroom/laboratory standards that require floor-to-floor heights of greater than 12.3 feet, which would not fit within the 37-foot height limit.

In response to questions and concerns about how students actually travel, SSCC conducted a Survey of Student Travel Behaviors to better identify student demographics and analyze their methods for traveling to and from campus. This Survey helped to identify why students drive alone to campus and gauge their awareness of various trip reduction programs. Details of the survey results are located at pp. 170 -176 of the FEIS.

Other changes in response to comments include: limited the extent of allowed small-scale development in the 100-foot setback along 16th Ave. SW; reduced the west edge frontage road; increased the setback adjacent to residential properties on the northern end of the western boundary; agreed to Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) review for future housing proposals, design of buildings in the northwest portion of campus, and future athletic field lighting; and clarified and expanded the discussion of objectives, alternatives, and baseline conditions in the final Master Plan.

II. GOALS, NEEDS, AND OBJECTIVES

A. Purpose of the Major Institution Master Plan

The purpose of the SSCC master plan is to further the College mission, goals and priorities. The purpose is also to resolve growth and change issues by providing physical campus and facility improvement direction. A specific objective of the planning effort is to secure a City Council approved Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP).

B. SSCC Mission

South Seattle Community College is a constantly evolving educational community dedicated to providing quality learning experiences which prepare students to meet their goals for life and work.

The College values and promotes a close involvement with the community and strong partnerships with business, labor and industry.

The college commits to meeting the diverse needs of students by providing:

- College transfer programs and technical and professional programs that prepare students to succeed in their careers and further their education.
- Responsive technical and professional training programs developed in collaboration with business, labor and industry.
- Student-centered and community centered programs and services which value diversity, support learning, and promote student success.
- Lifelong learning opportunities for the cultural, social, professional and personal development of the members of our communities.

SSCC has Institutional Goals related directly to the college mission statement

I. SSCC dedicates itself to quality educational programs and training to meet students' needs.

II. SSCC provides responsive student services and programs which support the learning and success of the diverse student population.

III. SSCC acquires and updates technological resources to facilitate its educational programs and student services.

IV. SSCC supports the continuous renewal of professional knowledge and skills in its diverse and collaborative community of highly qualified personnel.

V. SSCC provides an attractive environment that is conducive to student learning, physically accessible, safe, and secure, healthful and ecologically sensitive.

VI. SSCC collaborates with business and industry, labor, community-based organizations, K-12 schools, and other higher education institutions.

VII. SSCC engages in continuous self-assessment.

VIII. SSCC engages in responsible management of its resources

C. Issues and Needs

The profile of user needs for SSCC is characterized by:

- Increasing enrollment due to population growth trends (i.e. baby boom echo) and funding restrictions at 4-year institutions.
- Change in program needs mix (more academic transfer, healthcare, and technical programs)
- Shift to more full-time students as state 4-year institutions continue to restrict admission of freshmen.
- Need to replace aging space reaching the end of its useful life, particularly Cascade Court.

There are a number of major issues that are addressed by the master plan. The key issues include:

- Replacement of aging/failing facilities
- The location and nature of future growth
- Improving the campus' physical connection to the community
- Improving the quality and quantity of campus open space, particularly at the campus center
- Providing flexibility to accommodate greater-than-projected enrollment
- Determining feasibility of on-campus student housing
- Improving pedestrian access and circulation, particularly to allow better access to SSCC's unique retail and dining services

SSCC expects that the campus population will grow moderately in the next fifteen years. From a current full-time equivalent (FTE) of 4,000[4] (headcount of 8,500) in 2003-2004, the college and State Board for Community and Technical Colleges expect a 10 to 13 percent increase over the next fifteen years. This would result in an increase of 500 to 900 FTE students at the end of fifteen years (headcount increase of 1,080 to 1,930). To keep pace with increases in enrollment, faculty and staff increases would also occur. These are projected to amount to approximately a 6 to 7 percent increase at the end of fifteen years, resulting in an increase of about 30 staff FTE over fifteen years.

D. Master Plan Objectives

Overall and specific objectives for the current master plan are as follows:

<u>Overall Objectives</u>

- Reinforce the college as a student-centered campus which values diversity, supports learning, and promotes student success
- Use architecture and design to express and reinforce college values and mission
- Value existing open space and strengthen stewardship of the environment and connections within the campus community
- Create facilities which strengthen community connections
- Optimize operational and maintenance efficiencies
- Establish a dynamic, flexible, responsive framework for future growth and decision-making

<u>Specific Objectives</u>

1. Complement SSCC Instructional and Strategic plans and contribute towards improvements in:
    a. Campus aesthetics;

[4] Since many students carry less than full credit load each quarter (with many continuing education students taking only a single class) the actual number of students enrolled ("headcount") is much larger.

b. Accessibility and visibility;
c. Student gathering spaces;
d. Safety and security;
e. Operational efficiencies; and
f. Environmental stewardship

2. Satisfy City of Seattle MIMP requirements
3. Identify opportunities for additional development
4. Satisfy State Board for Community Tech Colleges/Office of Financial Management requirement to link future capital requests to campus master plan
5. Document existing campus-wide infrastructure layout
6. Document recent changes to the campus
7. Identify potential site for student housing on campus
8. Improve linkages with the neighboring community

III. MASTER PLAN ELEMENTS

A. Major Institution Overlay District

The existing Major Institution Overlay (MIO) District is irregularly shaped and extends from 16th Avenue SW on the west to the Duwamish Greenbelt on the east and from SW Brandon Street on the north to SW Morgan Street on the south. The State/SSCC owns all property within the existing boundary. A diagram of the district is on page 36 of the Final MIMP.

The major institution designation for the bulk of the district is MIO-37 (Major Institution Overlay District, 37 foot maximum height), which is proposed to change to MIO-50 (discussed in Section V, below). The underlying zone for this area is classified as L1, low-rise residential, and no change is proposed to this underlying zone. A portion of the campus core lies within the MIO-105 zone with a maximum height of 105 feet. The underlying zone for this area is designated as L-2, low-rise residential. No change is proposed to the MIO-105 or underlying L2 zones. The areas surrounding the campus are zoned as SF-5000 and SF-7200 (single family residential with minimum lot sizes of 5000 and 7200 feet respectively).

B. Development Program

The State/SSCC property ownership amounts to a total land area of about 87 acres, including a six acre arboretum. The SSCC campus is developed with thirty-five facilities amounting to a total building area of 501,363 SF.

The master plan proposes both planned development and potential development consistent with Major Institution code requirements (SMC 23.69.030). Planned Development includes projects, which are more definite and will likely occur in the near future. Potential Development includes projects that are less definite and may occur in the long-term future, although timing could change.

Planned Development

The SSCC master plan planned development includes four projects:

1. Removal of four existing portable structures and construction of the University Center, a two-story, 15,000 square foot classroom building (Building A);
2. Renovation and a 1,300 square foot expansion of the existing Pastry Annex (Building B);

3. Renovation and a 2,200 square foot expansion of the existing Automotive Collision Repair Building (Building C); and
4. Demolition of the existing Landscape Horticulture storage building and replacement with a one-story, 5,000 square foot building (Building D).

Additional details of the planned development may be found in the Final MIMP at pp. 18-19, 26-33 and the FEIS at pp. 15-23.

Potential Development

SSCC proposes potential development as detailed in this report at pp. 1-3, the Final MIMP at 18-33, and the FEIS at 15-25.

Master Plan Term and Phasing

The timing of SSCC proposed development is subject to extreme variability due to the uncertainty of State funding and project authorizations. The timing is identified by project in the previous description of planned and potential development. The timing is characterized as near term and long term.

Street/Alley Vacations

SSCC does not propose to vacate any public right-of-ways.

C. Development Standards

The details of the SSCC proposed development standards are discussed on pages 36-41 of the Final MIMP. Consistent with SMC 23.69.030, the development standards would modify and supersede the underlying zoning standards. Specifically, SSCC proposes to replace the underlying L1 and L2 zoning development standards with the MIMP development standards pursuant to the major institutions code (SMC 23.69).

Setbacks

SSCC proposes East and West setbacks of 100 feet and North and South setbacks equal to the underlying L1 zone. Potential small scale development would be allowed in setbacks with structures not exceeding 4,000 gross square feet and with related parking of no more than 20 vehicles. Other than the 4,000 square-foot limit, "small scale development" is not defined in the proposed Plan. These setbacks exceed the minimum requirement of the City Code. (See Final MIMP pages 36-37, and Figure 14, page 36).

In the future, development may be proposed which is of a scale where a difference of opinion exists as to whether its scale is small or medium. Therefore, it is recommended that such development be limited to one story (i.e., 18 feet in height plus exceptions for pitched roofs and rooftop features) and that no more than two developments, each limited to 4,000 gross square feet, may be built in the 100-foot west setback area.

The CAC is concerned about the extension of the existing campus 16th Avenue SW frontage road further north, bringing campus development closer to the residential properties adjacent to the northwest portion of the Campus. Therefore, the CAC recommends that any decision to re-align and extend the existing frontage road north of the existing central access to the Campus shall be subject to review by the SAC, including notice to the surrounding community.

Height

SSCC proposes to increase maximum height on most of campus from 37 to 50 feet, but to retain the 105 foot height limit at the campus core (see Final MIMP Page 38 and Figure 14, Page 36). This proposed change was expressed late in the process of working with the Citizen's Advisory Committee to develop the proposed MIMP. A 50 foot height limit is requested in order to provide adequate height to build three story buildings where the height of individual floors might be great enough that the building would not fit within the 50 limit. Specific MIO height designations are provided in SMC 23.69.004 and 50 feet is the next one up from 37 feet.

The CAC recommends that buildings in the northwest part of campus be limited to two - three stories and that special procedures and principles be invoked to minimize bulk and scale impacts. The CAC also recommends that, elsewhere in the MIO-50 zone, any proposal for a structure more than three stories shall be subject to formal review and comment by the SAC. This recommendation is included in the recommended conditions below.

The Director's recommendation, found in the analysis below, is that this height increase to MIO 50 be granted subject to the conditions noted.

Lot Coverage

SSCC proposes the maximum lot coverage for above grade structures to be 25% for the entire campus. Current lot coverage is around 12% and the underlying zones have lot coverage limits of 40 to 50%. Construction of all planned and potential buildings would result in 16% lot coverage, well below the maximum allowed in the underlying zones (See Final MIMP page 38).

The CAC has discussed creating an area identified as the developable campus area and setting a coverage limit for that area, rather than using the entire contiguous property owned by the College. The entire site includes extensive areas of steep wooded slope and of wetlands, neither of which would be expected to be developed and most of which could not be developed under current regulations.

The proposal for an upper limit of lot coverage is not, given the very large site of the College, a very limiting factor. The limit could be measured as a percentage of the entire site or as a larger percentage of a mapped developable area and either would provide for the same amount of development coverage.

While either approach can be used, the parcel dimensions for the entire College site already exist and those for a developable area would have to be created and mapped. DPD does not desire that both approaches be applied simultaneously as this would create added complexity without added benefit. Because the dimensions and area of the entire site have already been described and calculated, it seems preferable to describe lot coverage as a percentage of the entire site as proposed by the College.

Landscaping, Open Space, and Pedestrian Circulation

SSCC proposes the minimum amount of campus (excluding the Chinese Garden) open space to be 40% of the entire area within the MIO boundary. Landscape plantings should be of a scale and density that reinforces pedestrian circulation, defines campus gateways and building entries, enhances campus open spaces, and provides visual interest in all seasons. (See Final MIMP pages 38-41).

The CAC recommends that open space connections should be maintained on 16th Avenue SW between the north campus access road and the south campus boundary either as shown on the Long Range Plan in the MIMP, or similar connections constituting approximately the same total street frontage along 16th Avenue SW as shown in the MIMP. The CAC further recommends that the review of all future buildings should include an evaluation of the building's effect on maintaining these open space connections. This recommendation is included in the recommended conditions below.

Parking

SSCC proposes that parking locations and access remain at the north and south ends of campus. Parking will be increased in conjunction with planned and potential development to ensure that college related parking does not generate increased demand on neighborhood streets, but maximum on-campus parking spaces are not anticipated to exceed 2,095 in the long term (fifteen to thirty years).

D. Transportation Management Program

Details of the proposed TMP are given on pages 44-47 of the Final MIMP and the FEIS on pages 121-125. The proposed TMP is a modified continuation of the current TMP. Required details consistent with the major institution code are described, including the intent, location, authority, goals, HOV incentive, program elements, participants' responsibility, evaluation criteria and procedures, definitions and back -up details. The TMP is consistent with DPD Director's Rule 14-2002.

E. Phasing and EIS Alternatives

Project phasing is proposed but is dependent on State funding and authorization. Specific phasing of projects may vary and/or shift from that described. No master plan term is defined.

The Final EIS includes three alternatives: 1) no action, 2) increased building setback from the western boundary and different building locations, and 3) variable building setback from the western boundary and no student housing.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE FINAL MIMP PURSUANT TO SMC SECTION 23.69.032E

Requirements of the Director's Report and recommendation on the Final MIMP pursuant to SMC 23.69.032E are reproduced in this section and shown in **bold**. Text addressing each requirement follows each criterion. This analysis relies upon all sources of information developed as part of the referenced code requirement, including both the Final MIMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

> **In the Director's Report, a determination shall be made whether the planned development and changes of the Major Institution are consistent with the City's Major Institution policies in Section 23.12.120 and in the Land Use Element of the City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan, and whether the planned development and changes represent a reasonable balance of the public benefits of development and change with the need to maintain livability and viability of adjacent neighborhoods.**

The planned development and changes to the Major Institution, with the Director's recommendations, are consistent with the City's Major Institution Policies and Land Use

Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Provided that the proposed final MIMP is appropriately mitigated, approval would foster a reasonable balance of the public benefits of development and change with the need to maintain livability and vitality of adjacent neighborhoods. Mitigation is summarized at the conclusion of this report in the form of recommended conditions to be attached to approval of the final MIMP.

Consideration shall be given to:

a) The reasons for institutional growth and change, the public benefits resulting from the planned new facilities and services, and the way in which the proposed development will serve the public purpose mission of the major institution; and

b) The extent to which the growth and change will significantly harm the livability and vitality of the surrounding neighborhood.

The proposed growth of the institution is designed to reduce and remove impediments in its physical plant that limit its ability to meet its mission. The size, orientation, distribution and infrastructure of the buildings to be removed limit SSCC's ability to grow in a reasonable way through the provision of academic facilities and an environment that emphasizes community connections. Growth and change at the institution will be addressed by providing the physical campus and facility improvements directed by the Master Plan. The proposed University Center, Cascade Court replacement, and other new programmatic, administrative, and support facilities and related infrastructure appear necessary to fulfill SSCC's Mission.

One of the main issues of concern for the neighborhood has been the impact of increased traffic on several neighborhood streets. Of particular concern are the numerous segments that make up the collector arterial linking 16th Avenue SW with Delridge Way SW. With the proposed growth of the campus, concern about increasing traffic and transportation impacts has been raised throughout the process. These conditions were acknowledged by SSCC as part of the review.

The CAC specifically addressed the development of student housing as another important issue of concern for the neighborhood. Student housing raises concerns regarding traffic, transportation, parking, public services, and compatibility with the single-family character of the immediate vicinity. SSCC stated that it intends to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of student housing, including the availability of the services necessary to support such housing (Final MIMP p. 19). Based on these concerns for the livability and vitality of the surrounding neighborhood and SSCC's understanding of the need for further study, in the recommended conditions, SSCC shall be required to undertake a feasibility analysis prior to obtaining permits for student housing. SSCC shall also give public notice of the analysis and allow SAC and public comments.

Pages 52-53 and 64-68 of the Final MIMP provide detailed information about the public benefits from SSCC and how SSCC must grow and change to keep up with increasing demands for education and community programs. The College serves over 8,000 students each academic year, while also providing many benefits and programs to the community at large. Future enrollment for the master plan period is expected to increase, reflecting both population trends and limited funding for 4-year institutions.

Growth and change issues will be resolved by providing the physical campus and facility improvements directed by the master plan. The proposed academic and administrative buildings, supporting parking, and improvements to existing facilities are all parts of the necessary campus infrastructure to fulfill SSCC's mission, which includes service to the community. Educational, social/cultural and economic public benefits will result from the proposed master plan. Specifically, SSCC provides community meeting, event, and recreational space. The college facilities, public open space, recreational facilities are important resources that the MIMP will help ensure are better utilized by the community, while SSCC more ably meets its core educational mission. Forty percent of the campus is proposed to be designated as permanent open space.

In its Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP), the mission of SSCC is "to provid[e] quality learning experiences that prepare students to meet their goals for life and work". To specifically understand how this mission statement meets the intent of developing a new MIMP, SMC 23.69.002 provides some direction with language that describes the purpose and intent of the Major Institution code. These code sections are listed below in *italics* with analysis to follow:

> *A. Permit appropriate institutional growth within boundaries while minimizing the adverse impacts associated with development and geographic expansion;*

The MIMP for SSCC does not include an expansion of its boundaries. However, the proposal includes a significant increase in the development of the campus through several new buildings to replace aging infrastructure and expand the facilities. These new buildings will result in a significant increase in the total square footage of campus facilities. Rezones will result in additional height for much of the MIO. These increases, as analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement dated January 27, 2006 included mitigation for short term and long term impacts from planned and potential growth outlined in the MIMP. This program includes mitigation and/or identification of no significant adverse impacts for the following potential impacts to the environment from new construction under the MIMP:

- Water
- Plants and Animals
- Environmental Health
- Land Use/Relationship to Plans and Policies
- Aesthetics, Light/Glare, and Views
- Population and Housing
- Transportation, Circulation, and Parking
- Public Services
- Utilities

In addition to the environmental impacts and mitigation program detailed above, the MIMP includes a general discussion about mitigating efforts related to traffic and land use impacts, including the adoption of a transportation management plan (TMP) to address transportation impacts on surrounding neighborhoods, as well as measures to improve pedestrian links within and external to the campus.

> *B. Balance a Major Institution's ability to change and the public benefit derived from change with the need to protect the livability and vitality of adjacent neighborhoods;*

The College expects modest growth over the next ten to fifteen years. The MIMP provides a framework to direct future development in a way that benefits the college and the community by creating a strong campus center and improving the campus edge. The plan provides flexibility for long term growth in order to accommodate the college's changing programs and growing population.

Much of the proposed change is intended to enhance the livability and vitality of adjacent neighborhoods, not merely protect them. The intent of the MIMP is to revamp the internally focused campus design into a landscape architecture that is more inviting to the nearby community. By integrating campus with its surrounding environs utilizing "fingers" of development and a larger center campus open space with improved pedestrian circulation, the MIMP aims to enhance the campus' physical connection to the community. This will improve livability and vitality of adjacent neighborhoods by making the area more aesthetically pleasing while opening campus amenities like the arboretum and unique retail services to non-student access. These ideas build on the community-initiated pedestrian/bicycle route that aims to bind the neighboring communities along the West Duwamish Greenbelt, which also receives an improvement in the MIMP via a campus connection along the western boundary.

In general, the proposed change that arises from the MIMP pertains more to the physical plant and not a change or distancing from SSCC's stated Mission. Most, if not all of the planned and potential projects outlined in the MIMP are highly internalized to the campus. This new development is separated from potential impacts on surrounding neighborhoods due to geography and arterial improvements surrounding campus. There will be some increases in traffic resulting from increased enrollment, and there may be limited bulk and scale impacts resulting from higher heights in the rezone area. Notably, the MIMP identifies that enrollment increases are a reason for, not a result of, the MIMP's proposals. The MIMP and related environmental documents provide a series of mitigating measures to address potential impacts.

To the limited extent that increased building height (from 37 to 50 feet) could detract from the livability and vitality of the most immediate neighbors, this is more than offset by the existing natural screening of the 16th Avenue SW median and the 100 foot setback and other conditions proposed in the MIMP.

> *C. Encourage the concentration of Major Institution development on existing campuses, or alternatively, the decentralization of such uses to locations more than two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet from campus boundaries;*

The planned and potential development outlined within this document is confined to within the existing boundaries of the MIO, which will not increase as a result of the MIMP.

> *D. Provide for the coordinated growth of major institutions through major institution conceptual master plans and the establishment of major institutions overlay zones;*

This goal is provided for by the MIMP itself and supporting documents.

> *E. Discourage the expansion of established major institution boundaries;*

No such expansion is proposed.

> *F. Encourage significant community involvement in the development, monitoring, implementation and amendment of major institution master plans, including the*

establishment of citizen's advisory committees containing community and major institution representatives;

The Citizen's Advisory Committee, appointed by the Mayor and City Council, was created through significant outreach to the surrounding business and residential community. The Notice of Intent, required under the Land Use Code to form the CAC, was published in the city's Land Use Information Bulletin. In addition, outreach to stakeholders in the residential and business community occurred to develop potential members. The following is the list of all CAC members appointed, including City Staff:

Robert Rebar	SSCC Foundation
Bill Jaback	Resident/Riverview Trail Project
Steve Locke	Resident/Chinese Garden Society
Rogelio Riojas	Resident/Sea Mar CEO
Carlos Jimenez	Labor Council and General Community
Brian Higgins	Resident
Christine Torres	Resident/Safe Futures Coordinator
Vlad Oustimovitch	Southwest District Council President
Earl Cruzen	West Seattle Business Community
Roberta Greer	Tillicum Village Senior Vice-President
Tom Phillips	SSCC Faculty
Thomas Phillips	Resident
Phillipa Nye	Delridge Neighborhood Development Association
Steve Sheppard	Department of Neighborhoods
Cliff Louie	Department of Neighborhoods
Scott Kemp	Department of Planning and Development

Prior to the development of the draft report, 14 meetings were held by the CAC to review and comment on the development of several discussion drafts.

G. Locate new institutions in areas where such activities are compatible with the surrounding land uses and where the impacts associated with existing and future development can be appropriately mitigated;

Not applicable.

H. Accommodate the changing needs of major institutions, provide flexibility for development and encourage a high quality environment through modifications of use restrictions and parking requirements of the underlying zoning;

Please see section L below for additional information on development standards.

I. Make the need for appropriate transition primary considerations in determining setbacks. Also setbacks may be appropriate to achieve proper scale, building modulation, or view corridors;

Due to the boundaries of the MIO established by the area geography, appropriate transitions are generally provided. The western setback is proposed in the plan to be 100 feet. Combined with the natural screening provided by the median on 16th Avenue SW and the mild slope of the western side of campus, this 100 foot setback allows the campus buildings to be set-off from neighboring development with spacing appropriate to provide an inviting entrance to campus and

ensure campus buildings do not tower over or otherwise crowd adjacent single family residences. On the east side of campus, the proposed setback ensures minimum interference with the steep slope of the Duwamish Greenbelt; the nearest neighbor is roughly 1000 feet away and 250 feet downhill, thus there is no significant impact of the increased height allowed on campus. In the north area of the College site are located open undeveloped areas, areas of arboretum and horticulture use and the location of a Chinese Garden in its early stages of development. Much of the area has been designated a wetland and is unlikely to be developed. Along the western edge of this northernmost portion and undeveloped area of the SSCC site are a row of single family houses.

The draft MIMP leaves the underlying L-1 zoning to establish the amount of setback any structures must maintain from property lines. As there are no public streets in this area to establish front setback lines, it is very possible setbacks from the rear lines of the houses would be side setbacks in the L-1 zoning and they would be on the order of five to seven feet. Given the large scale of the SSCC holdings in this area and the large scale of structures may at some time construct, it seems prudent to establish a larger setback in this area.

> *J. Allow an increase to the number of permitted parking spaces only when it is 1) necessary to reduce parking demand on streets in surrounding areas, and 2) compatible with goals to minimize traffic congestion in the area;*

SSCC seeks additional parking spaces in excess of the maximum allowed for major institutions as dictated by SMC 23.54.016. The major institutions parking section establishes the number of spaces to be provided based on the number of students and faculty, capping the parking allowance at 135% of the minimum amount of parking required.

Based on 2003 enrollment, SSCC is required to provide 864 spaces and is capped at 1,166 spaces.[5] However, the 1993 Master Plan allowed SSCC to build up to 1,366 stalls based on adoption of a transportation management plan. Campus parking currently totals 1,220 spaces.

With the expected increases in enrollment, SSCC expects that parking demand will continue to be in excess of the maximum allowed under the Code, even as new parking is built with planned and potential development. Based on projected enrollment, SSCC will be required to provide 1,087 stalls and be capped at 1,467 stalls in 15 years; minimum and cap in thirty years will be 1,289 and 1,740 respectively. In contrast, the recommended year 15 parking supply based on demand is 1,480 to 1,590 spaces and 1,740 to 1,850 in year 30.

SSCC proposes that it be allowed to exceed maximum parking allotments by 200 spaces because of the nature of its student population pursuant to SMC 23.54.016.C.5. Unlike four-year institutions in Seattle, a large portion of the student population at SSCC is made up of part-time students who work while attending school. To successfully balance the needs of school and their work, such students need to rely on a form of transportation that allows them to move quickly between home, school, and work. The difficulty of these students' commute is only exacerbated by the fact that SSCC is located a notable distance from principal arterials and population centers and is in what could be considered as a geographically isolated area of the City. Given the nature of this commute, incentives designed to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles will generally not alter the manner in which these students travel to SSCC. Without additional

[5] Discussion of parking impacts and calculations can be found in the FEIS at pp. 104-105, 119-126.

campus parking, students would be forced to seek parking on neighborhood streets, increasing traffic congestion as they search for a spot.

The additional parking supply proposed meets the requirements of SMC 23.54.016.C.5 for three reasons:

1) The recommended additional parking supply is based on the correlation of observed peak parking demand characteristics and student FTEs. Forecasts show that additional parking is necessary to meet forecasted demand. SSCC supports an existing TMP that clearly provides opportunities for alternative means of transportation, but participation is limited due to the commuting requirements of the student body. See Student Travel Behavior Survey in the Final EIS at Page 170-176.
2) SSCC existing and future programs, including resource and recreational opportunities open to the general public, require access to adequate short-term parking.
3) SSCC manages short term parking by identifying parking areas and restrictions, which are enforced by campus security to ensure that parking supplies are available.

Further analysis should be conducted in the future to determine if enrollment/demand has decreased in order to determine whether additional parking is still needed to reduce neighborhood parking demand and traffic congestion.

> *K. Use the TMP to reduce the number of vehicle trips to the major institution, minimize the adverse impacts of traffic on the streets surrounding the institution, minimize demand for parking on nearby streets, especially residential streets, and minimize the adverse impacts of institution-related parking on nearby streets. To meet these objectives, seek to reduce the number of SOVs used by employees and students at peak time and destined for the campus;*

SMC 23.54.016 requires the development and implementation of a TMP if the proposed parking exceeds the 135% maximum from minimum parking requirements. The TMP requirements are generally discussed in the MIMP with specific analysis in the FEIS, based on the existing program, which appears to be as satisfactory as possible given the concerns noted above to address traffic impacts as well as any parking related impacts.

> *L. Through the master plan:*
>
> *1) give clear guidelines and development standards on which the major institutions can rely for long-term planning and development;*

As part of the MIMP, development standards governing height, coverage, open space and other related development standards found in the underlying zoning of the MIO were developed. Generally, most of these development standards are consistent with those for Institutions in the underlying zone. Height is addressed at length in Section V below regarding the rezone from MIO-37 to MIO-50. Importantly, the MIMP sets out specific requirements and guidelines for campus development in the next thirty years. SSCC will be able to rely on the guidelines and standards of its MIMP to plan the long-term functionality of the campus.

> *2) provide the neighborhood advance notice of the development plans of the major institution;*

In addition to the appointment of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) by the City Council, public notice was provided of actions by the CAC and City departments as follows:

- June 9, 2004 – Notice of Determination of Significance to require an Environmental Impact Statement and Notice of a Public Hearing on the Scope of the EIS
- April 7, 2005 – Notice of availability of the Draft EIS and Notice of Public Hearing
- April 7, 2005 – Notice of availability of the Draft Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP)
- and Notice of Public hearing
- January 27, 2006 – Notice of availability of Final EIS and Final MIMP

3) allow the city to anticipate and plan for public capital or programmatic actions that will be needed to accommodate development;

As required by the Major Institution code, referrals to City Departments, including Fire, Transportation, Public Utilities, City Light, and Human Services were made through distribution of the Draft and Final copies of the EIS and MIMP, as documented above.

4) provide the basis for determining appropriate mitigating actions to avoid or reduce adverse impacts from major institution growth; and

Various conditions are provided below.

M. Encourage the preservation, restoration and reuse of designated historic buildings.

No designated historic buildings are affected by this project.

1. In the Director's Report, an assessment shall be made of the extent to which the Major Institution, with its proposed development and changes, will address the goals and applicable policies under Education and Employability and Health in the Human Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The following Policies and goals specifically pertain to the development and implementation of the MIMP:

HDG4 Promote an excellent education system and opportunities for life-long learning for all Seattle residents.

HDG5 Promote development of literacy and employability among Seattle residents.

HD17 Work with schools, libraries, community centers, agencies and organizations to link services into a seamless system that helps students stay in school, including co-location and joint use of facilities to make a broader variety of services available to students.

HD18 Enhance opportunities for increased access to literacy development and English-as a Second Language (ESL) resources.

HD19 Work with community colleges, universities and other institutions of higher learning to promote life-long learning opportunities for community members and encourage the broadest possible use of libraries, community centers, schools, and other existing facilities throughout the city, focusing on development of these resources in urban villages areas.

HD20 Work with schools and other educational institutions, community-based organizations, and other governments to develop strong linkages between education and training programs and employability development resources.

The MIMP meets the goals of the Human Development element of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan Education and Employability goals and policies detailed above. Page 33 of the Final MIMP discusses the proposed development's consistency with these goals and policies. Educational, social/cultural and economic public benefits will result from the proposed master plan. Part of the mission of SSCC is to provide the neighboring community with meeting space, workshops, town hall meetings, and performing arts. Specifically, SSCC provides community meeting and event space for community workshops and town hall meetings. Further, the fact that SSCC is an educational institution directly meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The age of student populations includes a broad range of young and old. Both academic and vocational programs improve employment opportunities.

2. The Director's analysis and recommendation on the proposed master plan's development program component shall consider the following:

a) The extent to which the Major Institution proposes to lease space or otherwise locate a use at street level in a commercial zone outside of, but within two thousand, five hundred (2,500) feet of the MIO District boundary that is not similar to a personal and household retail sales and service use, eating and drinking establishment, customer service office, entertainment use or child care center, but is allowed in the zone. To approve such proposal, the Director shall consider the criteria in Section 23.69.035 D3;

SSCC does not propose to lease or otherwise use any space within 2500 feet of the MIO boundary.

b) The extent to which proposed development is phased in a manner which minimizes adverse impacts on the surrounding area. When public improvements are anticipated in the vicinity of proposed Major Institution development or expansion, coordination between the Major Institution development schedule and timing of public improvements shall be required;

There are only four planned projects under the MIMP. There are no public improvements identified in the vicinity of SSCC.

Phasing is addressed at pages 15-25 of the FEIS and pages 26-27 of the Final MIMP. The anticipated construction schedule for the Proposed projects is uncertain because funding depends upon the state, among other things. Construction of the Planned Projects is described in the final MIMP to occur within one year of master plan approval. The timing and phasing of the potential projects is even more uncertain, although it is described in the final MIMP to occur within fifteen years of master plan approval for the remainder of Phase I and within thirty years for Phase II.

c) The extent to which historic structures which are designated on any federal, state or local historic or landmark register are proposed to be restored or reused. Any changes to designated Seattle Landmarks shall comply with the requirements of the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance. The Major Institution's Advisory Committee shall review any application to demolish a designated Seattle Landmark and shall submit comments to

the Landmarks Preservation Board before any certificate of approval is issued;

There are no structures on the SSCC campus that are designated on any federal, state, or local historic or landmark register.

d) The extent to which the proposed density of Major Institution development will affect vehicular and pedestrian circulation, adequacy of public facilities, capacity of public infrastructure, and amount of open space provided;

The FEIS addresses the impacts on vehicular and pedestrian circulation, adequacy of public facilities, capacity of public infrastructure and open space. The impacts of the proposed density of SSCC on circulation, public facilities, infrastructure and open space will be adequately mitigated in the MIMP and by SEPA mitigation identified in the FEIS. Each element is discussed below.

Proposed Density

The proposed density of planned and potential development is discussed on page 26 of the final MIMP. The underlying residential zoning has no standards controlling development density in terms of maximum floor area ratio ("FAR"). No FAR limit is proposed in the MIMP. SSCC's existing FAR is approximately 0.13. Planned and potential projects, if all built at their maximum proposed square footage together would add 0.17 FAR, resulting in a total campus FAR of 0.3. The total amount of new development allowed under the MIMP would be 595,000 square feet and 106 student housing units. The Final MIMP provides that the FAR shall be calculated over the entire campus and not applied to individual sites, consistent with other master plans. The FAR calculation method allows the exclusion of parking and 3.5% for mechanical/electrical space.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation

Pages 58 of the MIMP provides discussion and analysis of both pedestrian and vehicular circulation on campus. The commitment to a low density campus that has a more open campus core will allow SSCC to strengthen pedestrian connections between buildings. Continuing to maintain the core developed portion of campus as a car-free zone will minimize pedestrian-vehicle conflicts and allow for improved definition and clarity of circulation routes to ease wayfinding. Additional mitigation can be found in the FEIS to address traffic and parking impacts associated with both planned and potential development, to be implemented at the time of new development.

Adequacy of Public Facilities

The Final MIMP will increase the adequacy of public facilities by allowing SSCC to offer more meeting, event, and recreational space to the community.

Capacity of Public Infrastructure

The FEIS did not identify any impacts related to public services that could not be mitigated.

Open Space

The Final MIMP encourages new development to be undertaken so as to create new open spaces or reconfigure existing open spaces that lack spatial definition. See pages 39-40 of the Final MIMP (particularly Figures 17 and 18) and FEIS pages 144-147. Although the open space required for uses in the underlying residential zone is significantly less (see SMC 23.45.016), the Final MIMP proposes a development standard requiring a minimum of 40% open space. The MIMP also encourages that open spaces be enhanced through landscaping and site furnishings. Under the MIMP, new development would enhance open space, especially by creating larger, more usable gathering areas.

e) The extent to which the limit on the number of total parking spaces allowed will minimize the impacts of vehicular circulation, traffic volumes and parking in the area surrounding the MIO District.

The Seattle Municipal Code places an upper limit on parking which can be supplied of 135% of the minimum required amount. As disclosed in the Transportation Management section of the MIMP the Land Use Code established maximum parking supply at 1,413 stalls in Year 15 and 1,740 stall in Year 30. The College proposes to continue a condition of providing parking in excess of the code limit under the new MIMP and pursuant to a new Transportation Management Plan.

The analysis in the FEIS supports the amount of parking to be provided to address both parking and traffic impacts. The amount of parking to be provided is in excess of that normally allowed by virtue of SSCC's qualification under SMC 23.54.016.C.5. SSCC's student population (many part-time students with full-time jobs) and geographic location necessitates that a large proportion of students, faculty and employees arrive by single occupancy vehicles. Traffic and parking impacts are disclosed in the SSCC Final Environmental Impact Statement. Conditioning to limit these impacts will be imposed pursuant to SEPA authority.

3. The Director's analysis and recommendation on the proposed master plan's development standards component shall be based on the following:

a) The extent to which buffers such as topographic features, freeways or large open spaces are present or transitional height limits are proposed to mitigate the difference between the height and scale of existing or proposed Major Institution development and that of the adjoining areas. Transitions may also be achieved through the provision of increased setbacks, articulation of structure facades, limits on structure height or bulk or increased spacing between structures;

As proposed in the MIMP, the transition in height and scale between SSCC development and the surrounding neighborhood will be achieved by standards for height, setbacks and landscaping/open space as well as use of the neighborhood features. The Final MIMP discusses these issues at pages 36-40. The proposed standards that establish lot coverage and open space requirements effectively create a building transition between the zone's height differences.

For example, the lot coverage limit in the underlying residential zone is up to 50%. SSCC proposes an institutional lot coverage limit of 25% (complete buildout of Phase I and II would

increase current lot coverage from approximately 12% to 16%). The site coverage limit will reduce the institutional building 'footprints' and create building separations.

Setbacks will range from the minimum required by the underlying zone to 100 feet from 16th Avenue SW. Where adjacent residences are closest to the campus along 16th Avenue SW, SSCC buildings will be buffered by the street median landscaping, a setback of at least 100 feet (although small scale buildings of less than 4,000 feet will be allowed in the setback), and the upward slope of 15 to 20 feet from the street to the developed area of campus. This minimizes the impact of the height of the main campus buildings. To the north, the Arboretum and Chinese Garden are dedicated open/recreational space and provide a buffer/transition from adjoining residential uses. The 100 foot eastern buffer and dedicated open space in that area provide additional transition and screening from the distant West Marginal Way industrial area.

Moreover, the intent and purpose of the MIMP is to transform the western edge of campus into a more open and inviting transition towards the developed area of campus. As new development occurs on campus under the MIMP, the campus connections to the community will be strengthened.

In short, the MIMP ensures that campus development is well-buffered from and provides proper transitions to adjacent uses by use of natural features, arterials, and the higher standards which it has imposed upon itself in its MIMP

b) The extent to which any structure is permitted to achieve the height limit of the MIO District. The Director shall evaluate the specified limits on the structure height in relationship to the amount of MIO District area permitted to be covered by structures, the impact of shadows on surrounding properties, the need for transition between the Major Institution and the surrounding area, and the need to protect views;

The SSCC campus is a very large parcel of land currently developed with buildings located great distances from property lines. The proposed MIO height limits would continue to locate the 105 foot height zone in the interior or the site, far from 16th Ave. S.W. This is an appropriate location for such building height and, although the College has no plan to develop to this height, to continue to provide a zoning envelope in this area for such height provides long term growth potential in a location where it is appropriate to have taller buildings. Moreover, according to the College's architects, current standards and trends for educational facilities require greater floor-to-floor heights than in the past. To meet these current standards, a three-story academic laboratory building would need to be about 47 feet high.

Thus, the current MIMP proposes to raise the height limit on the remainder of the campus from 37 feet to 50 feet. The MIMP contemplates that planned and potential development would occur in two and three story buildings.

The proposed MIMP does not specifically limit development in the 50 foot height area to three story buildings. The use of this flexible standard leads to a conclusion that under a number of future scenarios fifty-foot-tall buildings might be built in these areas. The CAC recommends that buildings in the northwest part of campus be limited to two - three stories and that special procedures and principles be invoked to minimize bulk and scale impacts. The CAC also recommends that, elsewhere in the MIO-50 zone, any proposal for a structure more than three

stories shall be subject to formal review and comment by the SAC. This is a reasonable approach.

Assuming fifty foot buildings might someday be built within the MIO-50 zone, the question to be considered is whether this is an appropriate scale of development. If the MIMP were to provide 100 foot setbacks from all areas which could be sensitive to a higher scale development (the west from 16th Ave. S.W., the northwest from single family development, and the east from property boundaries) the proposed 50 foot height limit would be appropriate. A major institution such as this one could reasonably be expected to build 50-foot buildings at some future date and 100 foot setbacks are generous anywhere in the city. An important element would be to insure that there is a firm 100 foot setback requirement on the west side of campus along 16th Ave. S.W. and on the east side of campus, while requiring development at the north and south campus boundaries to comply with the setbacks of the underlying zone. The Draft MIMP does not provide setbacks greater than those of the underlying zoning (five to ten feet) along property lines bordering single family zones and provisions regarding some amount of development to be allowed within the proposed 100 foot setback along 16th Ave. S.W. lessen the effectiveness of that setback. If any development is allowed within the 100 foot setback it should be carefully limited as to height and coverage. While the opinion of the College and the CAC should be given weight in this consideration in this respect, it seems a much clearer and more easily enforceable approach would be to simply observe 100 foot setbacks in the locations described herein.

c) The extent to which setbacks of the Major Institution development at the ground level or upper levels of a structure from the boundary of the MIO District or along public rights-of-way are provided for and the extent to which these setbacks provide a transition between Major Institution development and development in adjoining areas;

Setbacks are discussed at pages 29 and 36-37 of the Final MIMP. Proposed MIMP requires a 100-foot setback from the western boundary along 16th Avenue S.W. and the eastern boundary along the Duwamish Greenbelt; setbacks along the north and south boundaries are ten to fifteen feet, based on the requirements of the underlying zone.

The institutional standards for setbacks must be no less than the standards of the underlying zone or the zone of lots abutting or directly across a street or alley from the campus, whichever is greater. Here, the setbacks are either equivalent to the underlying zone or well in excess of the requirements of the underlying zone. These setbacks allow for transition between campus and adjoining areas by providing sufficient spacing between buildings/uses, particularly along 16th Avenue S.W. where the 100-foot separation allows for more open space and providing a more welcoming front to the campus from the community.

Discussion at the CAC has indicated a concern as to whether the underlying zoning provides adequate setback to provide adequate protection for residential uses along the western property line in the northwest portion of the campus site. Here, the new 50 MIMP height limit is proposed to abut single family zoning and uses in area with required setbacks of five to ten feet. Larger required setbacks are thought warranted in this area. It is suggested the MIMP be amended to require a 100-foot structure setback from the adjoining residentially-zoned property in this area.

d) The extent to which the allowable lot coverage is consistent with permitted density and allows for adequate setbacks along public rights-of-way or boundaries of the Major Institution Overlay District. Coverage limits should ensure that view corridors through Major Institution development are enhanced and that area for landscaping and open space is adequate to minimize the impact of Major Institution development within the Overlay District and on the surrounding area

As discussed above, the lot coverage limits are reasonable and adequate for the area in which SSCC is located. The Final MIMP proposes a lot coverage development standard of 25% maximum while the underlying zoning has 50% maximum. Complete buildout of the MIMP would result in lot coverage of 16%. Generally, the underlying and neighboring zones require setbacks that are equal to or much smaller than those required by the MIMP. View corridors in the area are limited; those that exist are not impacted by the proposed structures. In addition, the MIMP calls for development to improve or increase open space where possible. The proposed development standard for open space is 40% of the MIO District. All of these development standards and factors taken together show that the SSCC development will have a minimal impact on the surrounding area.

e) The extent to which landscaping standards have been incorporated for required setbacks, for open space, along public rights-of-way, and for surface parking areas. Landscaping shall meet or exceed the amount of landscaping required by the underlying zoning. Trees shall be required along all public rights-of-way where feasible;

Landscaping is addressed in the Final MIMP at pages 38-40. All parking facing 16th Avenue SW is required to be screened. The college will formally set aside the wooded area in the northeast corner of campus east of the Seattle Chinese Garden to offset larger building footprints in the next 15 to 30 years. Measures will be taken to protect the two "exceptional" trees on campus during construction and after. Improved landscaping is called for throughout campus, in a form providing consistency and connecting open spaces on campus. Pedestrian paths should be edged with large, deciduous canopy trees and low plantings that add seasonal interest.

f) The extent to which access to planned parking, loading and service areas is provided from an arterial street;

Proposed locations for parking will remain at the north and south ends of campus. The major access points for parking, loading, and service will continue to be at the existing north and south entrances off of 16th Avenue SW. Mitigating measures for traffic and parking issues are addressed in the FEIS.

g) The extent to which the provisions for pedestrian circulation maximize connections between public pedestrian rights-of-way within and adjoining the MIO District in a convenient manner. Pedestrian connections between neighborhoods separated by Major Institution development shall be emphasized and enhanced;

The Final MIMP at page 58 identifies the current system of pedestrian circulation and at page 16 discusses the improvement of the pedestrian environment as an important factor of the MIMP.

The MIMP further supports improvement of pedestrian circulation through its development standards for landscaping and open space. The MIMP's major goal of opening the western edge of campus to the community and creating a more inviting, connective entrance to campus will serve to enhance and emphasize connections between campus and the neighborhood.

h) The extent to which designated open space maintains the pattern and character of the area in which the Major Institution is located and is desirable in the location and access for use by patients, students, visitors and staff of the Major Institution;

The Final MIMP encourages new development to be undertaken so as to create new open spaces or reconfigure existing open spaces that lack spatial definition. See pages 39-40 of the Final MIMP (particularly Figures 17 and 18) and FEIS pages 144-147. Although the open space required for uses in the underlying residential zone is significantly less (see SMC 23.45.016), the Final MIMP proposes a development standard requiring a minimum of 40% open space. The MIMP also encourages that open spaces be enhanced through landscaping and site furnishings. Under the MIMP, new development would enhance open space, especially by creating larger, more usable gathering areas.

i) The extent to which designated open space, though not required to be physically accessible to the public, is visually accessible to the public;

All of the designated open space would be visually accessible to the public. Much of the designated space would also be physically accessible, although some areas are in the steep slope portion of the Duwamish Greenbelt bordering campus. Figures 17 and 18 at page 39 of the Final MIMP diagram the campus open space.

j) The extent to which the proposed development standards provide for the protection of scenic views and/or views of landmark structures. Scenic views and/or views of landmark structures along existing public rights-of-way or those proposed for vacation may be preserved. New view corridors shall be considered where potential enhancement of views through the Major Institution or of scenic amenities may be enhanced. To maintain or provide for view corridors the Director may require, but not be limited to, the alternate spacing or placement of planned structures or grade-level openings in planned structures. The institution shall not be required to reduce the combined gross floor area for the MIO District in order to protect views other than those protected under city laws of general applicability.

The Final MIMP protects and preserves the existing scenic views. SSCC does not have public view places protected under SEPA policies (SMC 25.05.675P and Attachment 1). The limited views that do occur along public right of ways will not be impacted by the final MIMP. No view corridor standards apply.

There are no designated historic landmarks on the SSCC campus or in the immediate vicinity.

4. The Director's report shall specify all measures or actions necessary to be taken by the Major Institution to mitigate adverse impacts of Major Institution development that are specified in the proposed master plan.

Those measures found necessary to mitigate adverse impacts of the Major Institution are listed at the end of this report.

RECOMMENDATION – MAJOR INSTITUTION MASTER PLAN

The Director recommends approval of the proposed Major Institution Master Plan with conditions.

V. ANALYSIS - REZONE

Background

Approval of the Final MIMP would require the rezone of property within the existing SSCC MIO from MIO-37 to MIO-50 as indicated in Figure 14 on Page 36 of the Final MIMP.

ANALYSIS – GENERAL REZONE CRITERIA

The code sections below will be highlighted in bold, with analysis to follow:

SMC 23.34.008 General rezone criteria.

A. To be approved a rezone shall meet the following standards:

1. **In urban centers and urban villages the zoned capacity for the center or village taken as a whole shall be no less than one hundred twenty-five percent (125%) of the growth targets adopted in the Comprehensive Plan for that center or village.**

Not applicable.

2. **For the area within the urban village boundary of hub urban villages and for residential urban villages taken as a whole the zoned capacity shall not be less than the densities established in the Urban Village Element of the Comprehensive Plan.**

Not applicable.

B. Match Between Zone Criteria and Area Characteristics. The most appropriate zone designation shall be that for which the provisions for designation of the zone type and the locational criteria for the specific zone match the characteristics of the area to be rezoned better than any other zone designation.

Analysis on this point is found in the section concerning rezones in Major Institution overlays, below.

C. Zoning History and Precedential Effect. Previous and potential zoning changes both in and around the area proposed for rezone shall be examined.

The proposed change in zoning is to raise the height limit for the lower of the two MIO areas from 37 feet to 50 feet. Zoning history has been stable on the site with an underlying residential zone and a major institution for a long period of time; in the case of the MIO overlay for the past 10 years, and in the case of the underlying zoning, since the current zoning code was enacted in the mid 1980's. The proposed adjustment is not contradicted by prior zoning actions and would

lead to an appropriate new standard to guide future building growth at SSCC in the context of the proposed master plan.

Any precedent setting effect resulting from approval of this rezone is not expected to have broad impacts in that the site characteristics are not common to the other properties in the larger surrounding area due to the major institution overlay and related uses.

D. Neighborhood Plans.

1. **For the purposes of this title, the effect of a neighborhood plan, adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995, shall be as expressly established by the City Council for each such neighborhood plan.**

SSCC borders the Delridge Neighborhood Planning Area and is located two blocks east of the Delridge Neighborhood Planning Boundary that was adopted and incorporated as part of the City's *Comprehensive Plan*. Because the campus is outside the adopted planning area boundary, the neighborhood plan does not specifically address the College. Indirectly, however, the plan recognizes the local importance of SSCC, and the wildlife habitat that the hillside/greenbelt proximate to the campus provides and the need to conserve the greenbelt.

2. **Council adopted neighborhood plans that apply to the area proposed for rezone shall be taken into consideration.**

Not applicable.

3. **Where a neighborhood plan adopted or amended by the City Council after January 1, 1995 establishes policies expressly adopted for the purpose of guiding future rezones, but does not provide for rezones of particular sites or areas, rezones shall be in conformance with the rezone policies of such neighborhood plan.**

Not applicable.

4. **If it is intended that rezones of particular sites or areas identified in a Council adopted neighborhood plan are to be required, then the rezones shall be approved simultaneously with the approval of the pertinent parts of the neighborhood plan.**

Not applicable.

E. Zoning Principles. The following zoning principles shall be considered:

1. **The impact of more intensive zones on less intensive zones or industrial and commercial zones on other zones shall be minimized by the use of transitions or buffers, if possible. A gradual transition between zoning categories, including height limits, is preferred.**

As proposed in the MIMP, the transition in height and scale between SSCC development and the surrounding neighborhood will be achieved by standards for height, setbacks and landscaping/open space. The Final MIMP discusses these issues at pages 36-40. The proposed standards that establish lot coverage, density (floor area ratio), set backs and open space limits effectively create a building transition between the height differences.

For example, the lot coverage limit in the underlying residential zone is up to 50%. SSCC proposes an institutional lot coverage limit of 25% (complete buildout of Phase I and II would increase current lot coverage from approximately 12% to 16%). The site coverage limit will control the institutional building 'footprints' and create building separations.

To the north, the Arboretum and Chinese Garden are dedicated open/recreational space and provide a buffer/transition from adjoining residential uses. The 100 foot eastern buffer and dedicated open space in that area provide additional transition and screening from the distant West Marginal Way industrial area.

DPD recommends that the MIMP provide 100 foot structure setbacks from: 16th Ave. S.W.; from the property boundary on the eastern extent of the College site, or the buffer width required by the City's Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance from the top of steep slopes, whichever is greater; and from the property lines contiguous with residentially-zoned properties on the northern end of the western boundary.

2. Physical buffers may provide an effective separation between different uses and intensities of development. The following elements may be considered as buffers:

a. Natural features such as topographic breaks, lakes, rivers, streams, ravines and shorelines;
b. Freeways, expressways, other major traffic arterials, and railroad tracks;
c. Distinct change in street layout and block orientation;
d. Open space and greenspaces.

The MIO district sits on a plateau, separated from other uses and intensities of development by natural features (steep slopes, elevation changes), major arterials (16th Avenue SW), and open space/greenspaces (designated setbacks, various campus open spaces). The nearest residential development lies to the west across 16th Avenue SW. Most current campus development and all potential MIMP development is set well back from the street on the plateau, east of a rise that sets the main campus building area 15 to 20 feet above 16th Avenue SW. The street itself serves as a physical buffer for the neighboring residential zones as it is quite wide and contains a tree-lined buffer. In addition, the MIMP proposes a 100 foot setback from 16th Avenue SW, in which no building larger than 4,000 square feet will be built. DPD recommends that the MIMP provide 100 foot structure setbacks from: 16th Ave. S.W.; from property boundary on the eastern extent of the College site, or the buffer width required by the City's Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance from the top of steep slopes, whichever is greater; and from the property lines contiguous with residentially-zoned properties on the northern end of the western boundary.

On its eastern border, the MIO district is also well separated from different uses and development intensities. Immediately east of campus is the Duwamish Greenbelt, a densely forested belt of land, areas of which are steep slopes. The Greenbelt stretches 1000 feet east from campus to West Marginal Way, where one finds the next nearest development to the east. The topographic relief between campus and West Marginal Way is 250 feet.

The northern end of campus is occupied by the Arboretum and the Seattle Chinese Garden. Both serve as large open/green spaces that buffer residential uses to the north from the areas of the

MIO district where SSCC development will occur. The southern end of campus is bordered by large tracts of city-owned land, which is currently slated to be preserved as a greenbelt.

3. Zone Boundaries.

a. In establishing boundaries the following elements shall be considered:

(1) Physical buffers as described in subsection E2 above;
(2) Platted lot lines.

The MIO boundary will not be expanded or altered with this MIMP.

b. Boundaries between commercial and residential areas shall generally be established so that commercial uses face each other across the street on which they are located, and face away from adjacent residential areas. An exception may be made when physical buffers can provide a more effective separation between uses.

Not applicable.

4. In general, height limits greater than forty (40) feet should be limited to urban villages. Height limits greater than forty (40) feet may be considered outside of urban villages where higher height limits would be consistent with an adopted neighborhood plan, a major institution's adopted master plan, or where the designation would be consistent with the existing built character of the area.

The higher height limit here, fifty feet, would be consistent with the SSCC master plan and the existing built character of the area.

F. Impact Evaluation. The evaluation of a proposed rezone shall consider the possible negative and positive impacts on the area proposed for rezone and its surroundings.

1. Factors to be examined include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Housing, particularly low-income housing;

Housing is not currently located on the site subject to the rezone request. There is housing in the surrounding area west of the campus. The MIO height rezone should not have a significant effect on housing in the surrounding campus.

b. Public services;

The rezone is designed to allow for improved and enhanced facilities associated with SSCC, thereby improving public services related to education. The MIO height change should not have a significant impact on fire, police, utility, or other public services in the vicinity.

c. Environmental factors, such as noise, air and water quality, terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna, glare, odor, shadows, and energy conservation;

An Environmental Impact Statement was prepared for this project that considered the potential impacts of the proposed master including the MIO height rezone. As the site is urban in

development and uses, there are minimal impacts anticipated due to the lack of existing natural environments and resources. Where there are some environmental impacts, such as to plants by construction of new buildings, the rezone for increased height does not further exacerbate impacts or raise them to a level where they become significant.

d. Pedestrian safety;

The MIMP associated with this project focuses on improving campus pedestrian connections and continuing the main developed area of campus as a car-free zone to reduce incidences of pedestrian-car conflict.

e. Manufacturing activity;

Not applicable

f. Employment activity;

It is anticipated that additional employment will occur on this site due to building proposed following the rezone. In addition, by allowing SSCC to better meet its educational mission and goals, the rezone will be enhancing economic activity throughout the City.

g. Character of areas recognized for architectural or historic value;

The FEIS for this project did not identify any resources of architectural or historic value that would be impacted.

h. Shoreline view, public access and recreation.

Not applicable.

2. Service Capacities. Development which can reasonably be anticipated based on the proposed development potential shall not exceed the service capacities which can reasonably be anticipated in the area, including:

a. Street access to the area;

Street access to the campus is adequate and will remain so, as discussed in the Transportation section of the FEIS. Although some impacts are expected to increase as a result of increased enrollment at SSCC, the FEIS indicates that much of the enrollment increase will occur regardless of campus improvements. The MIMP and associated projects are intended to prepare the campus to handle these enrollment increases. Moreover, the rezone/height increase is not intended to increase building footprints or capacity, but to allow for adequate floor-to-floor height to house academic and technical programs.

b. Street capacity in the area;

The arterial streets surrounding both sites have been evaluated for Level of Service (LOS) capacity as part of the FEIS. Although campus generated trips may cause some LOS impact at some intersections in the area, the increases in delay will be so minor that they will not likely be noticed by the average motorist. A transportation management plan will be adopted to provide incentives to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips to campus.

c. Transit service;

Transit service to campus is adequate and will remain so with continued bus service to downtown Seattle, White Center and other major transit centers, typically with 15 minute service during peak commute periods.

d. Parking capacity;

The underlying zoning requirements for the site are established in SMC 23.54.016 for Major Institutions. The rezone to allow greater height will not have an impact on parking capacity as the greater height of some buildings will not change the gross floor space proposed under the MIMP or other items that may influence the factors used to calculate parking capacity.

e. Utility and sewer capacity;

Review of utility capacity is reflected on pages 153 to 160 of the Final EIS. The rezone will not cause development to exceed the service capacities of the area.

f. Shoreline navigation.

Not applicable.

G. Changed Circumstances. Evidence of changed circumstances shall be taken into consideration in reviewing proposed rezones, but is not required to demonstrate the appropriateness of a proposed rezone. Consideration of changed circumstances shall be limited to elements or conditions included in the criteria for the relevant zone and/or overlay designations in this chapter.

Current standards and trends for educational facilities require greater floor-to-floor heights than in the past. To create properly functioning facilities that will meet the College's expected enrollment in the coming years (three story building with tall floor to floor distances) while still improving the campus as specified in the MIMP, additional height is required.

H. Overlay Districts. If the area is located in an overlay district, the purpose and boundaries of the overlay district shall be considered.

An evaluation of the rezone as it pertains to Major Institution Overlays is detailed below.

I. Critical Areas. If the area is located in or adjacent to a critical area (SMC Chapter 25.09), the effect of the rezone on the critical area shall be considered.

Portions of the Duwamish Greenbelt that are considered a steep slope and therefore a critical area under Chapter 25.09 border and overlap the eastern portion of the MIO boundary. As part of the MIMP, SSCC has proposed a 100 foot setback from the eastern boundary of the campus. This setback is well in excess of the fifteen feet from the top of a steep slop required by Chapter 25.09 and ensures that the rezone will have no effect on the critical area as no buildings will be built in or near the critical area.

Analysis – Section 23.34.124 (MIO Criteria)

The rezone analysis addresses criteria specific to designation of MIO districts (including height). As before, the criteria are stated in bold, with analyses below.

A. Public Purpose. The applicant shall submit a statement which documents the reasons the rezone is being requested, including a discussion of the public benefits resulting from the proposed expansion, the way in which the proposed expansion will serve the public purpose mission of the major institution, and the extent to which the proposed expansion may affect the livability of the surrounding neighborhood. Review and comment on the statement shall be requested from the appropriate Advisory Committee as well as relevant state and local regulatory and advisory groups.

SSCC has submitted the following rationale as part of their application:

Plan Purpose and Process

The purpose of the South Seattle Community College MIMP is to further the College mission, goals and priorities. Its intent is to help guide development of the campus over the next thirty or more years in terms of land use, open space, density of development, primary circulation systems and linkages with the surrounding community. The growth proposed in the MIMP's Near-Term Plan (10-15 years) is necessary to accommodate the projected growth of the College, while allowing enough flexibility to adapt to the changing programmatic needs of the College.

In today's knowledge-driven economy, the economic future of our citizens and our State depends more than ever on keeping higher education accessible. To ensure prosperity in this new century, Washington State cannot afford to leave anyone behind. A high-skill, high-wage economy requires a highly-skilled, well-educated workforce. This is the only path to a prosperous future. SSCC is a major player in making this happen.

The college expects modest growth over the next 10-15 years. The plan provides a framework to direct future development in a way that benefits the college and the community by creating a strong campus center and improving the campus edge. The plan provides flexibility for long term growth in order to accommodate the college's changing programs and growing population.

[T]he Final MIMP propose[s] a revision in zoning for most of the campus from MIO-37 to MIO-50. This is to accommodate the proposed development identified in the Draft MIMP program, which includes 3-story buildings. The basis for this change is to accommodate current classroom/laboratory standards for 3-story college facilities. For example, the proposed buildings would need floor-to-floor heights greater than 12.3 feet and, as such, would not fit within a 37-foot height limit. Therefore, the Final MIMP also proposes to increase height limits in the MIO-37 to MIO-50.

DPD concurs with this statement. No specific comment was offered to DPD by the CAC on this statement or from other interested parties or affected agencies.

B. Boundaries Criteria

Not applicable

C. Height Criteria.

1. **Increases to height limits may be considered where it is desirable to limit MIO district boundary by expansion;**

By increasing the MIO height limit, this rezone will facilitate the development of three-story college buildings that require greater floor-to-floor heights. Although the impact of this change is minor, allowing three-story development rather than limiting development to two stories, could have the effect of reducing somewhat the potential need to request a future boundary expansion.

2. Height limits at the district boundary shall be compatible with those in adjacent areas;

Height limits at the district boundary, combined with the MIMP required setbacks and designated open space, assure that the difference in heights allowed between the MIO district and neighboring residential zones will result in development compatible with nearby single family residences.

3. Transitional height limits shall be provided wherever feasible when the maximum permitted height within the overlay district is significantly higher than permitted in areas adjoining the major institution campus;

The maximum permitted height of 50 feet in the overlay district is not significantly higher than the 30-35 feet allowed in the adjoining SF-5000 and SF-7200 zones. Moreover, the 100 foot setback, arterial buffer, low lot coverage, and green/open space buffers discussed above provide adequate spacing from proposed MIMP development to the residential housing areas around campus.

4. Height limits should generally not be lower than existing development to avoid creating non-conforming structures;

The rezone will not create any non-conforming structures.

5. Obstruction of public scenic or landmark views to, from, or across a major institution campus should be avoided where possible.

Neither the rezone nor development pursuant to the proposed Final MIMP is anticipated to obstruct views of landmarks or scenic views.

D. In addition to the general rezone criteria contained in Section 23.34.008., the comments of the Major Institution Master Plan Advisory Committee for the major institution requesting the rezone shall also be considered:

The Citizens Advisory Committee was notified of the proposed change from MIO-37 to MIO-50 and did not object to this change.

RECOMMENDATION – REZONE

The Director recommends that the proposed rezone be approved.

VI. ANALYSIS - SEPA

A. Introduction

Analysis of impacts of the SSCC MIMP and proposed rezone is based on the Draft EIS, issued April 7, 2005, and the FEIS, issued January 27, 2006. Both documents were issued by South

Seattle Community College (SSCC) as the SEPA Lead Agency, in cooperation with the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development (DPD). The analysis is also based on site visits by the DPD Land Use Planner, public hearings and meetings, meetings of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), consultation with other City and County agencies including the Lead Agency representative and responsible official, and experience of DPD with similar projects.

An environmental impact statement is used by agency decision makers to analyze environmental impacts, along with other relevant considerations or documents, in making final decisions on a proposal. The SEPA ordinance contemplates that the general welfare, social, and other requirements and essential considerations of state policy will be taken into account in weighing and balancing project alternatives and in making final decisions. The EIS and supplemental documents provide a basis upon which the responsible agency and officials can make the balancing judgment mandated by SEPA, because it provides information on the environmental costs and impacts.

The proposed SSCC Final MIMP includes "Planned Projects," assumed for impact purposes to occur from the year 2005 to 2010 and longer term "Potential Projects," assumed to be developed between 2005 and 2035, if at all, dependant in large part on state funding. Potential projects are designated "near-term" Phase I projects for the next fifteen years or "long-term" Phase II projects to occur fifteen to thirty years from now. Shifting of projects between the phases and possible implementation of alternatives is considered by the FEIS. A project level impact analysis is given for the proposed MIMP, to the extent that the conceptual projects are defined. Additional environmental review may be required for the Potential Projects occurring in the long-term future or for Planned Projects, if required pursuant to SMC 25.05.600 (e.g., if there are substantial changes to the proposal).

This SEPA analysis is conducted to approve, condition, or deny the proposal pursuant to Seattle's SEPA policies. The Overview Policy, SMC 25.05.665, identifies the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority and clarifies the relationships among SEPA policies, other City codes and policies, neighborhood and business district plans, and Federal, State, and regional regulations. Where applicable City, State, regional, and/or Federal environmental regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be assumed that such regulations achieve sufficient mitigation.

Specific policies for each element of the environment and other policies explicitly referenced serve as the basis for exercising SEPA substantive authority.

The SEPA analysis includes both long-term/cumulative impacts and short-term construction impacts. Since the proposed MIMP was revised during the public review process, the Final MIMP and FEIS are most relevant to address the changed impacts associated with the impacts of the Final MIMP. Applicable sections of the FEIS are referenced along with the SEPA policy basis of authority. A summary analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed MIMP is included.

B. Impacts – Short-term

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased dust caused by drying mud tracked onto streets during

construction activities; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. The Street Use Ordinance requires watering streets to suppress dust, on-site washing of truck tires, removal of debris, and regulates obstruction of the pedestrian right-of-way. Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general. Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the City. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment.

Noise

The MIMP and related properties are located adjacent to, but not within any residential neighborhoods. While the City's Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08) establishes maximum permissible sound activities that the project intends to adhere to, residential development adjacent to the MIO boundaries may be adversely impacted by construction related noise. Construction hours will be strictly limited to comply with the Noise Code, unless a variance is sought.

C. Impacts – Long-Term and Cumulative Impacts

1. Land Use Patterns

Land use impacts are discussed on pages 60-68 of the FEIS. The land use pattern in the SSCC neighborhood would not be directly impacted by the proposed action. No land uses are proposed to change in the area surrounding the campus. Public or privately-sponsored, non-College development or redevelopment must be consistent with the City's *Comprehensive Plan* and *Land Use Code*. As such, no change is anticipated with regard to the land use character of the area. Slight indirect impacts such as demands for supporting uses (retail services, housing) may occur due to intensification of the College's functions.

Implementation of the MIMP would result in intensification of uses on-campus as a result of new taller buildings, remodeling, and intensifying development associated with existing buildings, reconfiguration of open spaces, and modification of parking areas. The rezone from MIO-37 to MIO-50 could result in somewhat taller buildings in the MIO-50 zone, except in the northwest portion of campus in which the height of new buildings would be restricted pursuant to a height condition recommended below. The potential impact of this higher height on adjacent neighborhoods would be adequately mitigated by the 100-foot setback requirement on the western boundary (next to 16th Ave. W. and next to the single-family homes on the northern end of the western boundary.) The character and pattern of land uses on-campus and in the general area would not change significantly under the MIMP, even if somewhat taller buildings are developed under the MIO-50 zoning. Although the percentage of overall lawn/landscaping would be reduced, undeveloped open space would remain the same as existing conditions.

Development of on-campus student housing is not expected to generate significant demand for new ancillary or support services proximate to the campus. This is because such uses already

occur on campus and would continue and/or be expanded, consistent with the MIMP. On-campus student housing may increase demand for non-college related support services, including healthcare, dental, grocery, gas, personal services, financial services, retail, restaurant, and entertainment facilities. Presently, the nearest shopping facilities are one mile away. However, the number of potential campus residents under potential MIMP development is relatively modest and would not, of itself, generate need for additional facilities. Prior to the development of student housing, SSCC will undertake a feasibility study to more accurately determine the types of uses and services needed to serve campus residents, as well as determine how such facilities would be accessed from campus.

2. Plans and Policies

The relationship of the Proposed MIMP with the Seattle Comprehensive Plan, Major Institutions Policies, the Seattle Land Use Code, the Delridge Neighborhood Plan, and the Seattle Environmentally Critical Areas Code is analyzed on pages 69 to 78 of the FEIS. As discussed throughout this report, the MIMP is consistent with Seattle land use plans and policies.

3. Water

Water impacts are discussed on pages 32 to 35 of the FEIS.

The development proposed for Phase I and Phase II of MIMP is not anticipated to adversely impact surface water movement on campus. Storm drainage from the developed portions of campus would continue to be collected and conveyed to the City storm drainage system along 16th Avenue SW. Surface water within the 18 acres of undeveloped woodland would continue to flow to Puget Creek and the Duwamish River. Overall, impacts to surface water resulting from the proposed action are not expected.

Due to the developed nature of campus and that no development is proposed for the forested areas of campus, no unique measures to mitigate surface water movement are anticipated for development under the MIMP. The City's standard code-mandated requirements regarding storm drainage conveyance, detention, and water quality would be imposed at time of individual project permitting in order to mitigate potential stormwater impacts.

As discussed in the Utilities section of the FEIS at pages 158 to 159 and 165, the stormwater system capacity on campus is generally adequate, but one segment of conveyance downstream from SSCC does not have adequate capacity to support complete buildout of Phases I and II of the MIMP. If necessary based on the amount of new campus development that is actually built, approximately 260 feet of storm drain may need to be upsized or SSCC could arrange for additional connections to the 16th Avenue SW drainage line to decrease flow to the potential chokepoint.

Development under the MIMP could encounter localized zones of groundwater within silt and outwash deposits, particularly in response to seasonal changes in precipitation. Perched groundwater could also be encountered at the contact point between fill soils and native glacial soils. However, based on previous geotechnical studies detailed in the FEIS and given the similarity in soil characteristics across campus, quantities of groundwater found are likely to be relatively small.

Due to the potential for groundwater seepage to be encountered during excavations (particularly during the winter months), it would be necessary to manage the seepage by digging interceptor trenches in the excavations and pumping from sumps.

4. Light and Glare

Light and glare impacts are discussed on pages 80 to 89 of the FEIS. The proposed action would result in additional light associated with stationary and mobile sources. Each of the new structures would provide exterior, low-level, security lighting and changes associated with landscaped open spaces would include modifications to pedestrian-scale lighting. Additional vehicular traffic associated with more intensive campus development would result in additional light from motor vehicles entering, exiting, and traveling on campus. Daytime glare will not be increased, and may be decreased, by the development proposed in the MIMP.

The MIMP also includes provision of an athletic field. The College represented to the CAC that there are no plans to light the athletic field. Proposals to install lights at athletic fields at other locations in Seattle have lead to heated local interest and opposition. The CAC recommends that any sports field lighting that is installed be designed to minimize the impact on the community at night through the use of shielded and directed light fixtures that direct lighting onto the playfields and minimize the infiltration of light beyond the field and that the Standing Advisory Committee be given an opportunity to review and comment on the design of any field light proposed for this or any location on campus. DPD concurs in this recommendation.

5. Aesthetics

Aesthetic impacts are discussed on pages 79 to 89 of the FEIS. Although occurring over an extended period of time (30 years), the visual experience would change as a result of the intensification of the campus uses, such as development of new buildings, remodeling of existing buildings, reconfiguration of open spaces, and modification of parking areas. Given the long period of time, it is likely that perception of change may be gradual. Therefore, impacts would be anticipated to be incremental and minimal over the course of this planning period.

Overall, the development that is proposed would result in larger buildings than presently exist. Lot coverage would increase from 12 to 16 percent, although this is significantly less than the permitted lot coverage limits in the underlying zones. Near-term replacement of the Cascade Court building would provide new opportunities to create open space and connection with the campus interior. The proposed west setback of 100 feet would improve the front face of the College, strengthen connections to the community, preserve steep slopes to the south, and allow for future development of a proposed, community-initiated bike trail within the setback.

The campus open space, including the Arboretum and the Seattle Chinese Garden, would be expected to play a significant role shaping the aesthetic image of the College and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.

The MIMP emphasizes SSCC's core values as they relate to the preservation, enhancement, and improved development of the main campus. Goals and objectives that were used in developing the MIMP specifically address improvements to the aesthetic experience in such areas as architecture and design; open space preservation and environmental stewardship; strengthening of community connections; accessibility and visibility; and development of student gathering spaces. Overall, impacts to aesthetics both on-campus and between the campus and the

surrounding neighborhood are anticipated to be minimal. If anything, changes to the aesthetic character would likely be perceived as positive.

6. Transportation and Parking

The FEIS discusses long-term transportation and parking impacts on pages 96 to 136. The overriding consideration, from the point of view of SEPA conditioning authority, is that the College has stated its enrollment will not substantially change by adding any of the planned or proposed projects. Rather, the proposed MIMP development is necessary to accommodate the growth in enrollment that has occurred and that SSCC will continue to see over the next fifteen to thirty years. While the SEPA document acknowledges some adverse parking and traffic impacts of college operations, it concludes that the relatively slight changes in impact possible under the MIMP warrant no new conditioning. SSCC further identifies the proposed continuation of its Transportation Management Plan as the most effective tool available for mitigation of transportation and parking impacts.

7. Plants and Animals

The FEIS discusses impacts to plants and animals on pages 36-47. Due to the amount of undeveloped land on or adjoining campus, implementing the MIMP may have both long-term and short-term consequences to plants and animals on and near campus, although impacts to animals will likely be minor. Of particular concern are two "Exceptional Trees" located on the eastern edge of campus. Plants will be affected by development and re-development under the master plan, likely resulting in the need to protect or replace trees, shrubs, and other plants affected by construction activities, new building locations, or surface runoff.

The FEIS proposes a number of mitigation measures on pages 46 and 47, including:

- Replacement of damaged/removed trees and shrubs with specimens of equal or greater educational and ecological value.
- Design replacements of existing campus structures to minimize impacts to trees and shrubs.
- Formally set aside the wooded area in the northeast portion of campus for open space.
- Under the guidance of an arborist, take appropriate measures to protect the Exceptional Trees.
- Consult the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats Database prior to each phase of construction to ensure no new data points are documented nearer to campus.

These proposed conditions will be imposed, pursuant to SEPA policy authority for plants and animals.

RECOMMENDATION – SEPA

The Director recommends that the proposed MIMP be approved subject to the SEPA conditions listed below.

VII. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The above report addresses criteria pursuant to Land Use Code Chapter 23.69, Chapter 23.34, and SEPA (Chapter 25.05). Conditional approval of the proposed Final MIMP is warranted. Recommended mitigation for the impacts is identified below.

Additional SEPA review may be required of particular development at the project level as required by codes and regulations at the time of permitting and further conditioning may be imposed at that time. In short, development pursuant to the proposed Final MIMP, as conditioned below pursuant to various, and often multiple authorities, would be consistent with the framework policy of the City's Major Institutions Policies and represent a reasonable balance of the public benefits of growth and continued vitality of SSCC with the need to limit negative impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS - MAJOR INSTITUTION MASTER PLAN

Non-appealable

1. SSCC shall create and maintain a Standing Advisory Committee to review and evaluate all proposed and potential projects at the time of submission of a Master Use Permit application.

2. SSCC shall comply with all provisions of the approved MIMP including but not limited to limits on the amount of allowed development in the Development Program, the applicable Development Standards, and the Transportation Management Program.

Appealable

3. The MIMP shall be amended to limit development in the 100-foot setback area adjacent to 16th Ave. to no more than two one-story developments, each no greater than 4,000 square feet and with each associated parking area not to exceed twenty spaces.

4. The MIMP shall be amended to provide that sports field lighting shall be a potential (long term) project and any sports field lighting that is installed shall be designed to minimize the impact on the community at night through the use of shielded and directed light fixtures that direct lighting onto the playfields and minimize the infiltration of light beyond the field and that the Standing Advisory Committee be given an opportunity to review and comment on the design of any field light proposed for this or any location on campus.

5. The MIMP shall provide the following structure setbacks: 100-foot setbacks from 16th Ave. S.W.; 100-foot setbacks from the property boundary on the eastern extent of the College site, or the buffer width required by the City's Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance from the top of steep slopes, whichever is greater; and 100-foot setbacks from the property boundary contiguous with residentially-zoned properties on the northern end of the western boundary.

6. "Height limits" on p. 38 of the MIMP shall be amended as follows: *"The master plan does not recommend any changes to the height limits in the MIO-105 area, however, height increase is proposed in the MIO-37 area which is proposed to be MIO-50.* ~~As noted in Master Plan Solution, f~~ Future development on campus will be ~~two- and three-stories above grade~~ subject to the following: (a) In the area bounded by 16th Avenue SW,

the North Entry Road, the east margin of the north parking lots, and a line perpendicular to the south margin of the north parking lots as shown on Figure 1, structures shall be limited to two – three stories. In addition, in order to mitigate for the potential height, bulk and scale impacts on surrounding residential properties, the College shall seek input from the surrounding neighborhood and the SAC regarding structure design. The process for obtaining comments shall be reviewed by the SAC and approved by DPD, and it shall be guided by the following principles:

i. Consideration shall be given as to whether the College's program can be effectively met with two stories rather than three while preserving open space, setbacks, and other site development objectives; and
ii. Landscaping and other bulk- reducing techniques shall be incorporated to reduce the appearance of bulk and height from 16th Avenue SW.

(b) Elsewhere in the MIO-50 zone, any proposal for a structure more than three stories shall be subject to formal review and comment by the SAC. Within the MIO-105' areas shown in Figure 14 …." [The rest of the "Height Limits" section is not changed.]

7. Prior to the issuance of a master use permit for student housing, the College shall undertake a feasibility analysis of developing student housing on the campus. The College shall give public notice, notify DPD and DON, and seek public and SAC comments on the analysis.

8. Any decision to re-align and extend the existing frontage road north of the existing central access to the Campus shall be subject to review by the SAC and include notice to DPD, DON, and the surrounding community.

9. For the life of the Plan, open space connections should be maintained on 16th Avenue SW between the north campus access road and the south campus boundary either as shown on the Long Range Plan in the MIMP, or similar connections constituting approximately the same total street frontage along 16th Avenue SW as shown in the MIMP. During the review of all future buildings, the College should evaluate that building's effect upon maintaining these connections. If the College proposes to change the open space connections on 16th Avenue SW from that shown on the Long Range Plan, it shall first provide notice to DPD and DON.

10. "Parking" on p. 40 of the MIMP shall be amended by adding the following at the end of that section: "As discussed in the TMP below, the forecasted parking supply exceeds the maximum allowed under the land use code. Therefore, the MIMP authorizes parking in excess of the code maximum to minimize adverse parking impacts in the adjacent neighborhood."

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS – SEPA

11. Replacement of existing structures on the central campus shall be designed and implemented in such a way as to minimize the damage and removal of the trees and shrubs that comprise the landscaping.

12. Trees or shrubs on the central campus that have been removed or significantly damaged as a result of construction activity shall be replaced with specimens of equal or greater educational and ecological value.

13. To mitigate for the inevitable increase in the built environment from construction of taller buildings with potentially larger footprints over the next 15 to 30 years, the College shall formally set aside the wooded area located in the northeast area of campus east of the Seattle Chinese Garden for open space.

14. During the planning for design and construction of new buildings and other development of the SSCC campus accomplish the following:

- Replacement of damaged/removed trees and shrubs with specimens of equal or greater educational and ecological value.
- Design to minimize impacts to trees and shrubs.
- Formally set aside the wooded area in the northeast portion of campus east of the Seattle Chinese Garden for open space.
- Under the guidance of an arborist, take appropriate measures to protect the Exceptional Trees and other trees to be preserved.
- Consult the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats Database to ensure no new data points are documented nearer to campus.

15. For each phase of construction the WDFW Priority Habitats Database should be re-reviewed to ensure that no new data points (species of concern) are documented nearer the site that may create buffers, as recommended by WDFW, which overlap with the campus.

16. SSCC shall continue to promote its required TMP in order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips to the campus.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: October 5, 2006

Scott Kemp, Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

SK:rgc
I:\KEMP\DOC\2307767_DPD_Recommendations.DOC